



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/707,677	11/07/2000	Alberto A. Lopez		9705

7590 01/29/2002
Path Group, Inc.
1019 North Colorado Street Suite 103
Gilbert,, AR 85233-2240

EXAMINER

PRASAD, CHANDRIKA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2839

DATE MAILED: 01/29/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/707,677

Applicant(s)

LOPEZ, ALBERTO A.

Examiner

Chandrika Prasad

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 November 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The reply filed on 12/18/01 consists of remarks related to rejection of claims. The claims are not allowable as explained below.

Drawings

- ✓ 2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show a single connector on one side connected to a plurality of connectors on the other side in Figure 4 as described in the specification (see Page 7, lines 18-21). Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
- ✓ 3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, each of the connector of the first type having a plurality of mating interfaces must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from claims 5-6. No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

- ✓ 4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Reference character 130 has been used to designate both a four-way connector and single input connector (see Page 7, line 26 and Page 8, line 10).

Art Unit: 2839

Appropriate correction is required.

5. The following is a quotation of an appropriate paragraph of 37 CFR 1.75:

(d) The claim or claims must conform to the invention as set forth in the remainder of the specification and the terms and phrases used in the claims must find clear support or antecedent basis in the description so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable by reference to the description. (See 1.58(a)).

6. The disclosure is objected under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(d) because the following have not been described.

- ✓ • Plurality of types (Claim 1, line 4).
- ✓ • Connector of the first type (Claim 5, line 1),
- ✓ • Each connector of first type having a plurality of mating interfaces (Claims 5 and 13, lines 1-2),
- ✓ • Connector of the second type (Claim 6, line 1),
- ✓ • First and second arrays of mating interfaces (Claims 20 and 26, lines 1-2),
- ✓ • Electrical conductors of the first and second plurality (claims 20 and 26, lines 4, 6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- ✓ • Regarding claims 1-17, the phrase "of types" renders these claims indefinite because it is unclear what "type" was intended to convey. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Art Unit: 2839

- Furthermore, the use of phrase "can be" in claims 1, 2, 4, 12 makes the claims 1-10 and 12 indefinite.

9. Claims 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are:

The independent claim 30 recites two portions but does not provide any structural relationship between the two portions, and furthermore no electrical connection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10-12, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Henry.

Henry (Figures 1-10) shows a shell (rack) 54 containing a plurality of electrical distribution blocks 10, each block having a plurality of parallel conductive paths (traces) 32, 34, 35, each having two opposite ends and a plurality of connectors 14, 16 connected at one end and a plurality of connectors 18, 20, 22 connected at the other end wherein the connectors 14, 16 at one end are different than those at the other end and are coupled by switch 52. Each end of the conductive path is connected to only one connector, and there are 5 connectors (14, 16, 18, 20, 22) which are more than the number of conductive paths (i.e., 3).

Art Unit: 2839

12. Claims 18-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sohler.

Sohler (Figures 1-3) shows a non-conductive fuse block 6 for an automobile with an array of fuse receptacles 8 with fuses 26 arranged in rows and columns, each fuse having terminals (blades) 28 connected to conductors 24, 42 on two ends.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 5, 7, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henry in view of Hughes.

Henry shows all the features of these claims as described in Paragraph 11 above except the connectors on one side having a plurality of interfaces, and a cable with non-circular cross section. Connectors having a single or multiple interfaces and circular or non-circular cables are well known in the art of electrical connectors. Hughes (Figures 1-10) shows a connector system with connectors in housing tiers 218, 219 at one end having an interconnected multiple interfaces, and a non-circular cable 121 at the other end. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to use a multiple interface connectors instead of two separate connectors because this would provide a more compact connector.

The instant invention does not provide any reasons or problems to be solved by having a non-circular cross-section. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill

• Art Unit: 2839

in the art at the time of the instant invention to use a non-circular cable because this would provide a thinner appearance as compared to circular cable having the same cross-sectional area as shown by Hughes.

15. Claims 9 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henry in view of Sohler.

Henry shows all the features of these claims as described in Paragraph 10 above except the use of fuses. The use of fuses is common knowledge and fuses arranged in rows and columns are routinely used in most circuit breakers in households as well as in automobiles. Sohler (Figure 1) shows an array of fuses arranged in rows and columns. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to use fuses between the conduction paths because this would protect the electrical devices connected to the distribution system.

16. Claims 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tarver.

Tarver (Figures 1-6) shows an electrical connector having a first portion 23 of conductive material with a circular hole to receive a multi-strand coaxial cable bundle 22, and a second portion 21 made of metal or plastic (column 2, lines 70-75) with a rectangular hole receiving an insulated cable 20 wherein the two holes are coaxial.

But Tarver does not specify the size of the rectangular hole being larger than that of the circular hole. The instant invention does not provide any reasons or problems to be solved by having size of the rectangular hole being larger than that of the circular hole. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to make size of the rectangular hole being larger than that of the circular hole

Art Unit: 2839

because such a modification would require a mere change in size, which would involve only routine skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Contact Information

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chandrika Prasad at (703) 308-0977. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus, can be reached at (703) 308-3119. The fax number for this Group is (703) 308/7722. Any inquiry of a general nature should be directed to the Group receptionist at (703) 308-1782.



Chandrika Prasad

January 16, 2002



**BRIAN SIRCUS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800**